

The Philanthropist.

JAMES G. BIRNEY,

We are verily guilty concerning our brother *** therefore, is this distress come upon us.

[EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.]

VOLUME 1.

NUMBER 7.

THE PHILANTHROPIST
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
NEW RICHMOND, CLERMONT CO., OHIO.

Terms.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable IN ADVANCE.
All Letters and Communications must be post-paid—and should be directed to the Editor of the Philanthropist.

Names of the Counties particularly should be mentioned in directing where papers are to be sent.

An Advertisement making one square or a space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted three times for One Dollar.

Slave-Holder's Department.

SOUTHERN ASSERTIONS COMPARED WITH SOUTHERN EVIDENCE!

This assertion is made almost every time the subje^ct o' slavery is alluded to in the presence of a southerner: "Why, sir, the slaves are very happy. Freedom would be the greatest curse that could be bestowed upon them. They would not take it, if it were offered to them."

Evidence in proof of the above assertion. "By an act of the General Assembly of North Carolina, in 1777, it is enacted: 'No negro or mulatto slave shall hereafter be set free, except for meritorious services' to be adjudged of and allowed by the county court."

By the laws of Louisiana; "No man can emancipate his slave, unless the slave has attained the age of thirty years, except a slave who has saved the life of his master, or his master's wife, or one of his master's children; such a one may be emancipated at any age."

Under laws like these, one slave received his freedom for discovering a cure for the bite of a rattle-snake; another received the same boon for giving information of a projected insurrection in Charleston, S. C., 1822; and another, a year or two since, received the curse of freedom for having, by a bold effort, stopped the conflagration of the state house, in Milledgeville, Georgia.

By the laws of South Carolina; "A slave endeavoring to entice another slave to run away, if provisions, horse, boat, or canoe, &c., shall be prepared for the purpose of aiding in such running away, shall be punished with DEATH. And a slave who shall aid and abet the slave so endeavoring to entice another slave to run away, shall also suffer DEATH!"

In Maryland, a slave received 39 lashes for harboring a runaway one hour.

In South Carolina and Georgia; "If a slave harbor, conceal, or entertain another slave, being a runaway, he is subject to corporal punishment to any extent, not affecting life or limb." "If a free negro harbor, conceal, or entertain a runaway slave, he shall forfeit the sum of £10 currency for the first day, and 20s for every succeeding day, &c. And in case such free negro shall not pay the same, together with charges attending the prosecution, he shall be ordered by the justice to be sold at public outcry."

In most of the slave states, it is enacted that; "Any person may lawfully kill a slave, who has been outlawed for running away and lurking in swamps."

The purchase of Florida was urged by slaveholders, not only because it would open a new market for their surplus slaves, but because it would enable them to secure runaways, who concealed themselves there. I have heard the same reason given for desiring the acquisition of Texas.

Governor Giles, in his address to the legislature of Virginia, 1827, speaking of the number of crimes punished by being sold into slavery, says: "Slavery must be admitted to be a punishment of the highest order; and according to every just rule for the apportionment of punishment to crime, it would seem that it ought to be applied only to punishment of the highest order."

In 1829, the same individual writes to LaFayette: "When I first came into the office of governor, such was the severity of the penal laws against that caste [free people of color] that for all capital offenses short of the punishment of death, and for many not capital, slavery, sale and transportation, formed the wretched doom denounced by the laws."

"There shall neither be slavery nor involuntary servitude in the territory north-west of the Ohio, otherwise, than for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been convicted." Among the states by which this was unanimously passed, were Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia.

Judge Upshur, speaking of Western Virginia, in the convention of 1829, says: "Their vicinity to non-slaveholding states must forever render this sort of property precarious and insecure."

Mr. Dodridge, before the same convention, said: "This property has heretofore been of little value near the Ohio river, because runaways received aid and protection from the people in the new territories and states."

Mr. Gholson of Virginia, a defender of slavery, said in the debate of 1832: "The free blacks operate as the connecting link between the class of abandoned and irclaimable whites, and the slaves themselves. With no regular occupations to restrain them from mischief, they act as the procurers of news, and the carriers of intelligence, and by their presence and association, are continually reminding the slave of the difference in their condition and the bondage in which he lives."

The same individual, in answer to a proposition that all slaves born after 1840 should be declared free, said: "And think you, sir, this will make the slave submissive, and the master safe? It will place by the side of the slave, day by day, those on whom the boon of freedom has been conferred—not on account of services or merit—but because they were born on a different day from himself. The day on which, by the provisions of your law, the one may walk forth in the full and unrestrained enjoyment of freedom, brings no joy or gladness to the other—it leaves him not only with the dark and gloomy prospect of perpetual bondage, but with afflictions ruptured, and attachments torn asunder. Put liberty and slavery side by side, and the beholder cannot refuse to contemplate them, nor to graduate the deformity of the one by the fair proportions of the other."

In consideration of the above facts, a few questions naturally present themselves. How can men who boast so loudly of their honor, make assertions so manifestly contradicted by their own laws, customs and precautions—and by the remarks of their

*This fear of the example and contagion of freedom, even in the miserable condition of the free colored people, constitutes the real basis of that unholy alliance, called the Colonization Society.

+Similar objections exist against all gradual schemes of emancipation. Experience has fully shown that the only safe process is immediate and unqualified emancipation.

own statesmen, when speaking among slaveholders only? If the slaves are so very contented and happy, why is a garrison built in Charleston for the inhabitants to resort to in case of insurrection? Why are their papers so full of advertisements for runaway slaves? Why are rewards offered? and agents appointed? and abolitionists feared?

Men surely do not run away from happiness—why then does the vicinity of free states render this sort of property "precarious and insecure"? If slaves would not take their freedom even if offered, why are such bloody laws made against all who attempt to run away, and against all who assist, harbor, or entertain them? If freedom be a "curse," what can we think of the humanity of those legislatures who bestow it upon the poor slave as a reward for "meritorious services"?—*N. Y. Eve. Post.*

SOUTHERN VIEWS.

PLAIN ENOUGH!—The following remarks of the Charleston Mercury, in reply to certain queries of the Philadelphia Enquirer, are as explicit as they are important—and certainly they are very important, if the Mercury speaks the sentiments of a great majority of the people of the south; which we doubt not.—*N. Y. Cur. & Eng.*

A COMPROMISE.—We recently gave a brief article in relation to the slave question, and expressed a hope, that, should the matter be unwisely thrust upon the attention of Congress, some such patriot as Henry Clay would step forward and (by a compromise calculated to satisfy both sections of the country) adjust the question. By compromise, we did not mean any interference on the part of the north with the rights of the south; or any authoritative dictation of terms to the south. Far from it—we only threw out the hint to elicit the real sentiment of the south; to ascertain if our brethren in that section of the union are opposed to every plan having for its object the remote but ultimate eradication of slavery, even should such a plan originate with themselves. Are they determined to resist all discussion of the slave question, even within their own borders? 1. Are they satisfied with the institution? and, considering it no evil, do they intend to entail it upon their latest posterity? 2. We put these questions in no spirit of unkindness to the south—for we hold that the north has no right to interfere with the matter; that the question is a domestic one, in which the people of the south are infinitely more interested than those of the north, and the adjustment of which belongs exclusively to themselves. We are opposed to the mad movements of the incendiaries, and will resist them to the last; but, for all this, we do feel some anxiety to know, if, after having quieted the north, having checked the fanatics, no plan will be suggested by the south in relation to slavery. 3. Are the people of that section perfectly content to continue the system, and would they refuse any offer on the part of the general government, to appropriate the surplus revenue towards the purchase of such slaves as their masters would be willing to sell? 4. We ask these questions because the Charleston Mercury has somewhat misunderstood our allusion to a compromise.—*Phil. Enq.*

REMARKS.—We are pleased to see the above explanation of the Enquirer, and proceed to answer its enquiries, so far as we are acquainted with southern sentiment, in which, touching this matter, we are sure we are not mistaken.

To all these questions propounded, we reply:

1. We cannot decide as to the possibilities of the future, but for the present, we say that there is not the least probability of a plan originating with the south, for the "remote but ultimate eradication of slavery," and that the south is opposed to every plan for that purpose.

2. The south will resist all recommendations of abolition, "even within their own borders."

3. The south is satisfied with the institution, consider it no evil, and hope to leave it to their posterity.

4. Whatever may be the issue of the present excitement, no plan will be suggested by the south, for the abolition of slavery.

5. Our people are perfectly contented to continue the system, and certainly would reject any offer from the general government, to appropriate the surplus revenue to emancipation. They hold that the general government has no right to touch the question; and that its interference with it, in any shape, would be dangerous and ruinous. The south will never consent to be bought out like the victims of West India emancipation, and the general government has no right to use the surplus revenue for any such purpose.—*Charleston Mercury.*

EXTRACT FROM DR. CALDWELL'S ADDRESS ON EDUCATION.

We never expected to have it imposed on us as a duty, to place Dr. Caldwell of the Lexington Medical School, in the company to which he is consigned below. The liberality of his attainments—his literary character; the station he fills—all, should have restrained him from drinking in at once the feculence of the thorough-paced slaveholder. That such sentiments can be entertained by any intelligent man, at the present day, without some extraneous bias, we do not believe. We know not to what extent Dr. C. claims property in his fellow man—not to a very great one we suppose. What, then, can account for such evasions of lava and ashes? May it not be that he estimates too highly the favor, that is to be won in the south for the Medical School in which he is a professor?

"Closely allied in vice to the southern conspirators, and standing in the relation to them of counsellors and abettors, are the leading and active abolitionists of the north. When the deliberate, dark, and dannatory nature of their crime against millions of their unoffending fellow-citizens is considered, and when it is further observed that their measures cannot possibly benefit any one, it is neither unjust nor extravagant to say, that a class of deeper and more flagitious malefactors has rarely, if ever, outraged human law, and set heaven at defiance. Yet do they come forth to perpetrate their deeds of horror, under the mantle of religion and philanthropy. So did the butchers of Bartholemew's, in common with the bands of *human i. f.*, who gave the primitive Christians to lions and tigers, put the Apostles to the most cruel and ignominious forms of death, and crucified the Messiah! All was done for the love and glory of a god, or gods of some kind—and for the benefit of the human race! And under the same foul and detestable pretence, are the abolitionists striving to effectuate their purposes of conflagration and blood! Let me not be told that they act under a delusion, which lightens their guilt. That this is true of the mass of them, I do not doubt, because they are utterly ignorant of the subject on which they act and

declaim. But of that body I am not speaking. My allusion is, as already stated, to the leaders of the gang, in making an estimate of whose guilt it is impossible to be extravagant. There is neither a kind nor a degree of crime, which man can commit, that would not follow in the train of practical abolition. There are two forms of abolition—immediate, and gradual; and in point of evil in the end, it would be difficult, at this time, for the utmost stretch of human discrimination and forecast to decide between them. It seems to me inevitable, that both would be consummated by the extinction of the blacks, or their reduction to a much worse condition than they now enjoy. This would unquestionably be the issue, unless they were transported to the land of their forefathers—a task which appears hopeless, if not impossible. Be these things, however, as they may, the question is exclusively social and political, and has no more connexion with practical and useful religion, than the form of our government, or the construction of rail-roads.

As to that boundless source of mischief and calamity, militant religion, its ambitious spirit embraces everything. Nor have true and enlightened benevolence and philanthropy, anything to do with abolition, measures, except to forbid them. These measures have led already to an abridgment of the privileges and comforts of the slaves, and, if not abandoned, will necessarily operate to the same effect, in a much higher and more painful degree. Self-defence will be, and ought to be provided for, by the slaveholding states. Women and children must not be exposed unguarded to the unbridled lust and prey of the blacks, excited to rebellion by unprincipled abolitionists. In charity to the slaves, therefore, in whose welfare they pretend to take so deep and holy a concern, those reckless fanatics should relinquish their scheme of lawlessly interfering with the rights of others, and attend to their own. Unless they do so through choice or compulsion, the unavoidable result will be the DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION. And, deplorable as that event would be, it cannot be denied, that it would be the better alternative—less to be deprecated, I mean, than the perpetual dread and frequent occurrence of insurrections and servile war in the slaveholding states.

The paper containing the *Proclamation* which follows was sent to us some time ago. It would be looked upon as the playful effort of a weak and light mind—for which no one but the writer should be held responsible, were it not that it has been acted on;—blood has flowed; lives have been taken; and here is proof of the indifference, with which deeds of death are perpetrated, and of the merry humor which they excite.

Do these things rouse the indignant feelings of any of our dough-face editors? No: we have just read an account of the recent *murder* of two men by the citizens (vigilance committee) of Jackson, Louisiana—it is given with as much calmness as if it was an account of two stray dogs that had been shot.

From the Truth Teller and Sentinel.

PROCLAMATION.

To Messrs. Tappan, Garrison, Lundy, and all other Abolitionists, who shall see these presents: Greeting.

WHEREAS, you have kindly, generously, and without solicitation, undertaken to regulate the relations existing between master and slave in the southern states, and have, for that purpose, sent your emissaries with divers publications of an inflammatory character amongst us; and we being sensible of the many obligations conferred upon us that behalf, and being further desirous of returning whatever acts of kindness to you that good neighborhood may require at our hands, we,

Therefore, wish to inform you, that in every county throughout the slaveholding states, we have at our own proper costs and charges, erected a gallows one hundred and fifteen cubits high for your exclusive use. Not wishing, in any wise, to entrap you with arraignments, or indictments, or perplex you with the uncertainties of prosecution, and, moreover, being credibly informed that your sole object is, to obtain the crown of martyrdom in the holy cause of abolition; we would,

Therefore, as a matter of especial grace and favor, (instantly upon your arrival within our borders) translate you from earth to the gallows, erected prominently high for your benefit;—not doubting in the least, that when the glad tidings shall reach you of the splendid reparations we have made for your reception, the benevolent intentions we have towards you, and the great solicitude which is universally felt in the south to confer the highest honors upon you; that you will instantly come forward and offer yourselves a willing sacrifice to the great cause in which you are engaged.

You need not doubt or mistrust, but that we will, with heart and hand, most cordially aid you in obtaining the high prize which is in prospect for all true abolitionists who may come within our borders.

An apology we owe you. The two itinerant abolitionists, upon whom we have already conferred the honors of martyrdom, were not treated with the honor and dignity due to their rank and calling. The want of time and opportunity to make preparations suitable to the occasion, did not permit us. We were compelled to hang them up to a scrub oak, instead of doing them the honor of a gallows one hundred cubits higher than that on which Haman hung. But having now made ample preparations, we pledge ourselves, that everything appertaining to that subject shall be done secundum artem.

SOUTHERN STATES.

We have received the 1st and 2nd numbers of the Philanthropist, an abolition paper, just commenced in New Richmond, Ohio, by James G. Birney Esq., formerly of this state. Mr. Birney first attempted his project of publishing an abolition paper in Danville, Kentucky; but finding that the people in that region were not willing to have the spirit of disobedience and rebellion infused into the minds of their slaves, had to abandon his purpose of publishing his paper there. His next aim was at Cincinnati, Ohio; but there again he found the people would not suffer him to prosecute his enterprise. With a firmness of purpose and a perseverance deserving a better cause, he located himself in New Richmond, a village, we are informed, situated not far from Cincinnati, Ohio; we will advise Mr. Birney to change his location to the free negro settlement near Georgetown, Ohio, described in an article which the reader will find in another column, credited to the Cincinnati Gazette. He then can tell us from personal observation, of the great polish the African is susceptible of, and the excellent citizen he will make, when manumitted and left to himself. If the description given by the Gazette be correct, and we doubt not it is, the condition of the free negroes there, the rapid advances they have made in improvement, and their industrious habits would certainly serve as great stimulants to Mr. Birney to persevere in his philanthropic efforts

and abolition schemes! By the way—we had a severe bout several years ago, with a fellow who published a paper in Georgetown, Ohio, called the Castigator. We could not then account for his strong feelings of hostility to the slaveholder, but the difficulty is now solved. He is doubtless a member of one of the families which the Gazette says have improved a little, and assumed rather a mahogany, than a jet black appearance. The fellow went so far as to express a hope that the scenes of St. Domingo would be acted over again at the south; a sentiment that very few, even of the slaves themselves, entertain. It is left for those who have been freed by the mistaken philanthropy of their masters, and have been bleached a little, after the manner of the Blue Spring or Choctaw Academy, in this state.—*Lex. Obs.*

—to cross-examine the witnesses—to procure counteracting testimony, or to be heard in his defense."

Had you, sir, done to others, as it thus seems you would that others should do to you, no occasion would have been given for this protest. You must truly assert, in relation to the conduct of the Senate, "It is the policy of our benign system of jurisprudence, to secure in all criminal proceedings, and even in the most trivial litigations, a fair, unprejudiced, and impartial trial." And by authority, sir, do you except such of your fellow-citizens as are known as abolitionists, from the benefit of this benign system? When a fair, unprejudiced and impartial trial has been accorded to those who dare to maintain that all men are equally entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? What was the trial, sir, which preceded the judgment you have rendered against them?

Fourthly, We protest against the vagueness of your charges.

We cannot more forcibly describe the injustice you have done us, than by adopting your own indignant remonstrance against what you deemed similar injustice on the part of the Senate. "Some of the first principles of natural right and enlightened jurisprudence, have been violated in the very form of the resolution. It carefully abstains from averring in which of the last proceedings the President has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws. Why was not the certainty of the offence, the nature and cause of the accusation, set out in the manner required in the constitution, before even the humblest individual, for the smallest crime, can be exposed to condemnation? Such a specification was due to the accused, that he might direct his defence to the real points of attack. A more striking illustration of the soundness and necessity of the rules which forbid vague and indefinite generalities, and require a reasonable certainty in all judicial all gations, and a more glaring instance of the violation of these rules, has seldom been exhibited."

It has been reserved for you, sir, to exhibit a still more striking illustration of the importance of these rules, and a still more glaring instance of their violation. You have accused an indefinite number of your fellow-citizens, without designation of name or residence, of making unconstitutional and wicked efforts, and of harboring intentions which could be entertained only by the most depraved and abandoned of mankind; and yet you yourself abstain from averring which article of the constitution they have transgressed; you omit stating when, where, and by whom these wicked attempts were made; you give no specification of the inflammatory appeals, which you assert have been addressed to the passions of the slaves. You well know that the "moral influence" of your charges will affect thousands and tens of thousands of your countrymen, many of them your political friends—some of them heretofore honored with your confidence—most, if not all of them, of irreproachable characters; and yet, by the very vagueness of your charges, you incapacitate each one of this multitude from proving his innocence.

On the 25th March, 1834, the Senate of the United States passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That the President, in relation to the public revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both."

On the 15th of the ensuing month, you transmitted to that body your "solemn protest" against their decision. Instructed by your example, we, now, sir, in behalf of the society of which we are the constituted organs, and in behalf of all who are associated with it, present to you, sir, our "solemn protest," against your grievous and unfounded accusations.

Should it be supposed that in thus addressing you we are wanting in the respect due to your exalted station, we offer in our vindication your own acknowledgment to the Senate: "Subject only to the restraints of truth and justice, the free people of the United States have the undoubted right as individuals, or collectively, orally or in writing, at such times and in such language and form as they may think proper, to discuss his (the President's) official conduct, and to express and promulgate their opinions concerning it."

In the exercise of this "undoubted right," we protest against the judgment you have pronounced against abolitionists.

First, Because, in rendering that judgment officially, you assumed

book, the tale of fiction, and the costly annual, have been placed under the ban by southern editors for trivial allusions to slavery—and that a southern divine has warned his fellow-citizens of the danger of permitting slaves to be present at the celebration of our national festival, when they might listen to the Declaration of Independence, and to eulogisms on liberty—we have little hope that our disquisitions on human rights will be generally deemed safe and innocent, where those rights are habitually violated. Certain writings of one of your predecessors, President Jefferson, would undoubtedly be regarded, in some places, as insurrectionary as to expose to popular violence whoever should presume to circulate them.

As therefore, sir, there is no common standard by which the criminality of opinions respecting slavery can be tested, we acknowledge the foresight which prompted you to recommend that the "severe penalties" of your proposed law should be awarded, not according to the character of the publication, but the intention of the writer. Still, sir, we apprehend that no trivial difficulties will be experienced, in the application of your law. The writer may be anonymous, or beyond the reach of prosecution, while the porter who deposits the papers in the post-office, and the mail carrier who transports them, having no evil intentions, cannot be visited with the "severe penalties;" and thus will your law fail in securing to the south that entire exemption from all discussions on the subject of slavery, which it is so vehemently desired.

The success of the attempt already made to establish a censorship of the press, is not such as to invite farther encroachments on the right of the people to publish their sentiments.

In your protest, you remarked to the senate, "The whole executive power being vested in the President, who is responsible for its exercise, it is a necessary consequence that he should have a right to employ agents of his own choice to aid him in the performance of his duties, and to discharge them when he is no longer willing to be responsible for their acts." He is equally bound to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, whether they impose duties on the highest officer of state, or the lowest subordinate in any of the departments."

It may not be uninteresting to you sir, to be informed in what manner your "subordinate" in New York, who, on your "responsibility" is exercising the functions of Censor of the American press, discharges the arduous duties of this untried and until now, unheard, of office. We beg leave to assure you, that his task is executed with a simplicity of principle, and celerity of despatch unknown to any Censor of the press in France or Austria. Your subordinate decides upon the incendiary character of the publications committed to the post-office, by a glance at the wrappers or bags in which they are contained. No packages sent to be mailed from our office, and directed to a slave state, can escape the vigilance of this inspector of canvass and brown paper. Even your own protest, sir, if in an anti-slavery envelope, would be arrested on its progress to the south, as "inflammatory, incendiary, and insurrectionary in the highest degree."

No veto, however, is as yet, imposed on the circulation of publications from any printing-office but our own. Hence, when we desire to send "appeals" to the south, all that is necessary is, to insert them in some newspaper that espouses our principles, pay for as many thousand copies as we think proper, and order them to be mailed according to our instructions.

Such, sir, is the worthless protection purchased for the south, by the most blushing and dangerous usurpation of which any public officer has been guilty since the organization of our federal government.—Were the Senate, in reference to your acknowledged responsibility for the conduct of your subordinates to resolve, "that the President in relation to the suppression of certain papers in the New York post-office, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the constitution and laws, but in derogation of both;" instead of protesting against the charge, you would be compelled to acknowledge its truth, and you would plead the necessity of the case in your vindication. The weight to be attached to such a plea, may be learned from the absurdity and inefficacy of the New York censorship. Be assured, sir, your proposed law to punish the intentions of an author, will, in its practical operations, prove equally impotent.

And now, sir, permit us respectfully to suggest to you, the propriety of ascertaining the real designs of abolitionists, before your apprehensions of them, lead you to sanction any more trifling with the LIBERTY OF THE PRESS. You assume it as a fact, that abolitionists are miscreants, who are laboring to effect the massacre of their southern brethren. Are you aware of the extent of the reproach, which such an assumption casts upon the character of your countrymen? In August last, the number of anti-slavery societies known to us, was 263; we have now the names of more than 350 societies, and associations are daily made to the multitude who embrace our principles. And can you think it possible, sir, that these citizens are deliberately plotting murder, and furnishing us with funds to send publications to the south, "intended to instigate the slaves to insurrection?" Is there any thing in the character and manners of the free states, to warrant the imputation on their citizens of such enormous wickedness? Have you ever heard, sir, of whole communities in these states, subjecting obnoxious individuals to a mock trial and then in contempt of law, humanity and religion, deliberately murdering them? You have seen in the public journals, great rewards offered for the perpetration of horrible crimes. We appeal to your candor and ask, were those rewards offered by abolitionists, or by men whose charges against abolitionists, you have condescended to sanction and disseminate?

And what, sir, is the character of those whom you have in your message held up to the execration of the civilized world? Their enemies being judges, they are religious fanatics. And what are the haunts of these plotters of murder? The pulpit, the bench, the bar, the professor's chair, the hall of legislation, the meeting for prayer, the temple of the Most High. But strange and monstrous as is this conspiracy, still you believe in its existence, and call on Congress to counteract it. Be persuaded, sir, to the moral sense of the community is abundantly sufficient to render this conspiracy utterly impotent, the moment its machinations are exposed. Only PROVE the assertions and insinuations in your message, and you dissolve in an instant every anti-slavery society in our land. Think not, sir, that we shall interpose any obstacle to an enquiry into our conduct. We invite, nay, sir, we intreat the appointment by Congress of a committee of investigation, to visit the Anti-Slavery Office in New York. They shall be put in possession of copies of all the publications that have issued from our press. Our whole correspondence shall be submitted to their inspection; our accounts of receipts and expenditures shall be spread before them; and we ourselves will cheerfully answer under oath whatever interrogatories they may put to us relating to the charges you have advanced.

Should such a committee be denied, and should the law you propose, stigmatise us as felons, be passed without enquiry into the truth of your accusation and without allowing us a hearing, then shall we make the language of your protest our own, and declare that, "if such proceedings shall be approved and sustained by an intelligent people, then will the great contest with arbitrary power which had established in statutes, in bills of rights, in sacred characters, and in constitutions of government, the right of every citizen to a notice before trial, to a hearing before condemnation, and to an impartial tribunal for deciding on the charge, have been made in VAIN."

Before we conclude, permit us, sir, to offer you the following assurances:

Our principles, our objects, and our measures, are wholly uncontaminated by considerations of party. Whatever may be our respective opinions as citizens, of men and measures, as abolition-

ists we have expressed no political preferences, and are pursuing no party ends. From neither of the gentlemen nominated to succeed you, have we any thing to hope or fear; and to neither of them do we intend, as abolitionists, to afford any aid or influence. This declaration will, it is hoped, satisfy the partisans of the rival candidates, that it is not necessary for them to assail our rights, by way of convincing the south that they do not possess our favor.

We have addressed you, sir, on this occasion, with republican plainness, and Christian sincerity; but with no desire to derogate from the respect that is due to you, or wantonly to give you pain. To repel your charges, and to disabuse the public, was a duty owed to ourselves, to our children, and above all, to the great and holy cause in which we are engaged. That cause we believe is approved by our Maker; and while we retain this belief, it is our intention, trusting to His direction and protection, to persevere in our endeavors to impress upon the minds and hearts of our countrymen, the sinfulness of claiming property in human beings, and the duty and wisdom of immediately relinquishing it.

When convinced that our endeavors are wrong, we shall abandon them; but such conviction must be produced by other arguments than vituperation, popular violence, or penal enactments.

ARTHUR TAPPAN,
WILLIAM JAY,
JOHN RANKIN,
ABRAHAM L. COX,
JOSHUA LEAVITT,
SIMEON S. JOCELYN,
LEWIS TAPPAN,
THEODORE S. WRIGHT,
SAMUEL E. CORNISH,
ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jr.
Executive Committee.

NEW YORK, DEC. 26, 1833.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

Communications.

THE SLAVE.

The dews of midnight gather'd on his brow,
And still he kuekt in pray'r. The bitter thought
Of all he had endur'd, must still endure;
The days—the years of unrequited toil,
The coarse and scanty fare, the tatter'd garb,
The taunt, the bitter curse, the bloody scourge,—
All these and worse, far worse, the sufferer knew.
They had withheld from him the bread of life,
Had crush'd his spirit, bound his soul in chains,
And borne him to the earth. But these were wrongs,
Scarce felt—scarce heeded, while his infant boy
And the fond mother welcom'd him with smiles,
When his hard task of day was o'er. But they—
Where were they? Sold! as beasts of burthen sold!
That very morn, he saw them chain'd and driv'n
To a far distant clime. Marvel ye then,
That he should turn from earth and ask of Heav'n,
Power to endure such weight of bitter wrong?
For nature, unsuol'd, demanded blood.
While thus he lieth his head in fervent pray'r,
A light from Heaven dispels the vengeful gloom:
He bows his toil-worn form to earth and cries,—
"Vengeance is thine, Thou wilt repay, O, God!"—M.

TO THE CLERGYMEN OF CINCINNATI.

We sometimes find ourselves, reluctantly and, perhaps, without cause, cherishing opinions respecting the conduct and motives of those, whom we respect and honor, injurious to them and extremely painful to us. Whenever this is the case, it becomes our duty to lay before them the reasons of our entertaining such opinions; and it will be their duty, and of conscientious men, their privilege to correct our views if they are erroneous, or to profit by them if they are well founded. Especially is this true as it respects ministers of the gospel, whose usefulness will surely be greatly diminished, or entirely destroyed, if a suspicion once gets abroad, that in any one thing, they are governed by wrong or dishonorable motives.

Permit me, therefore, in a spirit of kindness, to say, that I find it impossible to reconcile with the sacredness I have been accustomed to suppose ought to belong to the character of "servants of Christ," the very great indifference, which most of your number have manifested in relation to the moral and spiritual welfare of a class of the population of your city,—I mean the colored people. Before proceeding to state more particularly, in what forms this indifference manifests itself, I would premise, that the charge comes not from the abolitionists—for the writer is not a member of an Anti-Slavery Society, nor an advocate of many of the measures of the abolitionists; yet he is one of those who believe, that we have a duty to perform to the poor and the ignorant wherever found, and who cannot see in what way the imprudence of others releases us from the obligation imposed upon us by the command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." The charge here preferred against the clergy of Cincinnati, has no relevancy to the "vexed question" of slavery; it relates simply to a dereliction of duty on their part towards their neighbors, some of whom are their own Christian brethren and sisters.

I will now specify some of the particular forms in which your want of interest has manifested itself—or, if you please—in which your interest has not manifested itself. In the first place, the intellectual or the moral improvement of the free colored people around you, does not seem to enter at all into your plans of doing good to your fellow-men. Some of you seem to be, and doubtless are, zealously engaged in many of the benevolent enterprises of the day—in foreign and domestic missions—in bible and tract societies—in educating the poor children of our white population, and the German and Irish emigrants;—on the importance of these benevolent and charitable purposes, you preach to us from the pulpit; you solicit our contributions; you form societies; you appoint agents, send out missionaries to foreign lands, and into the destitute parts of our own country; you print and publish to the world your plans and your purposes; and no labor or expense is thought too great, if you can but communicate the gospel to your destitute fellow-men in heathen lands. All this is right—I most heartily approve it. But while you thus labor and pray for wretchedness and misery in India, in China, in the isles of the Pacific, or among the natives of our own country, and the emigrants from Ireland and Germany,—where are your prayers, your alms, and your sympathies, for the poor, despised, and persecuted among you, who differ in nothing from other men, but in the color of their skin? I attend your ministrations on the Sabbath—I hear you put up solemn prayer for the Hindoo, the Chinese, the Jew, the Greek; for the Indians within our borders; for the different classes of society in our community—professional men, merchants, planters, laborers, &c. But the poor black man—he is forgotten, or at least, every expression which would be likely to bring his case before the minds of the congregation, seems to be carefully excluded from your petitions. This, alone, is evidence to me, that you either do not feel interested for him, or that you are governed less by your own views of duty, than by the selfish

policy of keeping in the good graces of the influential members of your societies. But, perhaps, you may conscientiously refrain from making any direct allusion to the colored portion of our population, in public prayer on the Sabbath,—from a conviction that the effect would be to excite unholy feelings in the minds of some present.

Without stopping to discuss such refined expediency, let me ask you, Do you pray for the black man in your closets? Does his case come up before your mind as an entire subject of special supplication? I suppose you would be unwilling to acknowledge that it does not; and if we may judge by scriptural induction, of the truth of the matter, it will not, perhaps, be necessary for you to make any such acknowledgement. You teach us from the Scriptures, that prayer without faith is mockery; and that faith without works is vain, or spurious. We have a right, then, to judge you by your works, and now, what do your works show? What are you doing to elevate the moral character, or relieve the wants of your colored neighbors? I cannot learn that you are doing anything.

Do you know that a few individuals are laboring and toiling, and sacrificing all the comforts and many of the necessities of life, in the cause of teaching the colored children of your city? And what are you doing to aid and encourage them in their pious and benevolent efforts, to raise from ignorance and degradation, these immortal minds? Do you visit their schools, give them your advice, and encourage them in their labors? Do you recommend this to the wealthy members of your societies, as a cause worthy of their support? When you come before your congregations on the Sabbath (as some of your number do) and represent to them the importance and the duty of sustaining the German Sabbath Schools; and when you speak of the sacrifices of those who spend a few hours on the Sabbath, in teaching the children of these emigrants;—do you forget, that there are in your city, three day schools and two Sabbath schools, for colored children,—and that six individuals are giving their whole time, and a few others a part of their time, as teachers in these schools? If you do not, when and where may you be heard to speak of these things? I have myself made enquiry of some of your number, respecting these schools; but I did not happen to enquire of those of you who knew much, or seemed to care much about them. You preach to us about our duty:—will you let us know whether you have not some duties also? And as many of your hearers view your silence on the subject of instructing the colored children, inconsistent with your frequent and earnest calls for contributions to support schools for the instruction of poor white children, you would extricate us from a very unpleasant dilemma, by explaining how the two things may be reconciled.

CRITO.

MR. EDITOR:—The following is an extract of a letter from a lady in New Hampshire. It shows the feelings that exist towards the colored man, and the means used to withhold from him his rights.

"We had an anti-slavery address a short time since, which met with much opposition. The great men rallied, and collected a company of the worst rakes in town, and excited a mob, and doubtless there would have been trouble, had not the abolitionists abandoned the idea of occupying the meeting-house. They met in a private dwelling, and the mobbing party collected, took a long pole, and beat upon the house while the address was delivering, with a noise like that of guns. The address was delivered by a Methodist minister, from Concord, who is an excellent man.

Some of the people think we shall have the negroes here in our families. Dr. S. of H., has made a calculation of how many that town will have to take; and how many each family must have.

Our minister is a firm abolitionist, and is not afraid to pray for the poor forsaken degraded slave; but I doubt whether he would dare appoint a meeting, and say, slavery would be the subject of his discourse."

It seems never to have entered the mind of Dr. S., that should slavery be abolished in the slave states, the soil would still remain, and must be cultivated principally by the colored people. Why should it not? Does he think, if slaveholders should come to a sense of justice—should break every yoke and let the oppressed go free—should make laws to protect them in their just rights and family relations, that they would flee such kindness; while thousands of their brethren who are free, still remain, notwithstanding all the oppressive laws that have been made to compel them to leave? If so, he mistakes the principles of human nature; or,

Does he think, when slaveholders have found that the divine precept, As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even to them likewise,—embraces the slaves also;—when they have put themselves in the place of the slaves, and considered the horrors of separating husbands and wives, parents and children; of closing up the bible from them by law, and placing men and women under the control of irresponsible masters, for whatever purpose they are disposed to use them; and when, having prayed for direction on the subject, their consciences have compelled them to let them go—that they will turn upon them, and thrust them out from their sight? Christian duty and Christian sympathy are the main springs of the abolition enterprise; and that kindness which could effect the emancipation of the slave, can never fail of a response in his breast when made free. Were it not so, self-interest on both sides, would secure the continuance of the slave when freed, where his labor is so constantly needed.

Perhaps Dr. S. is not apprised that slavery was abolished in Mexico from motives of self-interest alone; the planters finding that freemen performed so much more labor than slaves, it became an object to make them all free, that they might employ them as hired laborers. On the island of Antigua, since the abolition of slavery, estates have rented for more than they did when slavery existed,—the slaves necessary to carry them on there included.

We are all the slaves emancipated, they would never trouble your town, Dr. S. Their labors are needed at home. But this is not the question for a Christian to settle in his own conscience, when the principles of duty and eternal justice are at stake. Can you withhold your consent and your prayers for the emancipation of two millions of your fellow-beings from cruel bondage, on the possible contingency of a little inconvenience to your town, when God has said, Woe to him that useth his neighbor's services without wages, and giveth him not for his work,—when that bondage, in its character, hope-

less and interminable, sets at defiance the ordinance of God which places a sanctity on the family relation?—[of the marriage state our Saviour says, What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder;—to parents, he says, Train up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;—and to children, Obey your parents in the Lord;—but slavery disregards these precepts:]—when that bondage withdraws from its victims the bible by law, making it death, (in some of the states, at least,) for a person to be found teaching a colored person to read that sacred book, while our Saviour says, Search the Scriptures;—and when every feature of that bondage is sinful, begetting habits of idleness, and administering to the basest passions of the master, and debasing the mind, and degrading the body of the slave to the level of the brute! When such is the character of slavery, how can a Christian forbear to pray for its speedy termination—and to act in consistency with his prayers? C.

A CARD.

The subscribers wish through the medium of the Philanthropist, to acknowledge the receipt of fifty-six dollars, from ladies of Pittsburgh and Allegheny, Pa., which they have kindly committed to our disposal for the benefit of the anti-slavery cause.

We know of no department of that cause stronger in its intrinsic claims, fuller of glorious promise, and certainly none so necessitous at the present moment, as the schools, &c., in Cincinnati, for the benefit of the black population—we have accordingly appropriated the above donation to their benefit. There are about three thousand black persons in that city—one half of them emancipated slaves. For the last two years—there have been six instructors most of the time employed in teaching schools—lecturing, visiting—organizing associations, and in various ways promoting their intellectual, moral and religious improvement.

Four of the teachers are ladies—they have toiled without salaries—have not received in all, more than half enough to pay for their board—have expended long since their all, of personal funds—are now, much in debt, and for a considerable time past have been boarding themselves and living on bread and water. They have done this in order to avoid expense which they were unable to meet—and rather than appeal to the friends of the cause by a statement of their necessities. These facts are published without their knowledge, and against what we know to be their wishes—but we deem them the property of the anti-slavery cause, and would in common honesty give it its own.

We take this method to inform the benevolent donors, of the disposition made of their charity—and in the name of a people persecuted, yet not forsaken—most heartily to thank them for it.

THEODORE D. WELD,
AUGUSTUS WATTLES.

Pittsburgh, Pa., Jan. 18, 1836.

MR. EDITOR:—Report says that the inhabitants of a certain district, back of New Richmond, in conjunction with some Kentuckians, contemplate an onset upon your offices, for the purpose of dispersing your "tell-tale" types. I am rightly informed, the ground of the assault is, that the citizens of New Richmond have no business to suffer the establishment of an abolition paper in their village. It is difficult to understand, what right any set of men have, to dictate to the people of that town, what kind of a paper they shall, or shall not permit, to be established among them. And will not such a procedure, if carried into effect, be a great interference with domestic relations? If the report is unfounded, you will please to make the necessary correction. But if true, let the facts be published, if you are in possession of them.

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY.

REMARKS.—We would say, in reply to our correspondent, that, so far as the people of any settlement in this vicinity are concerned in the above report, we do not believe, there is a word of truth in it. We have not heard of a single instance where any disposition has been manifested by the neighboring population to put down the liberty of the press, or to restrain the freedom of speech and discussion. Although they may, and doubtless do, differ much as to the immediate abolition of slavery, there is—unless we have been greatly misled—a perfect identity of feeling and opinion, as to the undisturbed maintenance of those safeguards of our republican institutions.

It is not at all improbable, that the "report" has been occasioned by the proceedings of the "great Anti-Anti-Slavery Meeting" in Cincinnati. For, nothing, surely, would give to our slaveholding neighbors greater encouragement to commit an outrage on the people of this state, than a resolution deliberately passed by "judges, and merchants, and lawyers, and divines, and physicians"—by Presbyterians, and Baptists, and Methodists, and members of almost every religious denomination—to exert every lawful effort not only to suppress our paper should it be established in Cincinnati—but to extend their paternal and patriotic guardianship for the same purpose to the "neighborhood" at large. The freemen of the "neighborhood" doubtless, have great confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of the gentlemen who were prominent in the "great Anti-Anti-Slavery Meeting in Cincinnati"; yet, it is believed, should they be permitted to use the common law right of choosing their guardian, that they would not select gentlemen who are engaged in a war on institutions, which, should it be successful, will be the means of always keeping them and their children in a state of wardship and pupillage. They, in all probability, look upon any assault on the freedom of the press, as tantamount to an assault on the great estate of liberty bequeathed to them, by their ancestors as a rich inheritance, which they desire to make perpetual for themselves and their offspring.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

NEW RICHMOND, OHIO, FEBRUARY 12, 1836.

HAS CONGRESS THE POWER TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA?—The people of the United States, in making their constitution, gave to Congress, power "to exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such District, not exceeding ten miles square, as might by cession of particular states and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States." There is no difference of opinion, as to the fact of cession by the states of Virginia and Maryland. By this act, they parted with all authority over their respective shares. Neither their legislative assemblies, nor even the

ble and admirable in state legislation! The states, and the people of the states are represented in Congress. The District has no representatives there, but is subjected to the exclusive legislation of the former. And yet Congress, at home republican, will here nourish aristocracy. The states will here lay the foundation for the destruction of their own institutions, rights and sovereignty. At home, they will follow the legislation of the District, instead of guiding it by their precept and example. They will chose to be the engines of tyranny and oppression in the District, that they may become enslaved within their own territorial sovereignty. What but a disposition to indulge in all sorts of delusions and alarms could create such extraordinary flights of imagination? Can such things be and overcome us like a summer's cloud without our special wonder? At this distance of time, it seems wholly unnecessary to refute the suggestions, which have been so ingeniously urged. If they prove anything, they prove, that there ought to be no government, because no persons can be found worthy of the trust."

Mr. Madison, in speaking of this power, says, "the indispensable necessity of complete and exclusive power [on the part of Congress] at the seat of government, carries its own evidence with it." Again: "The extent of this federal District is sufficiently circumscribed, to satisfy every jealousy of an opposite nature. And as it is to be appropriated to this use with the consent of the state ceding it; as the state will, no doubt, provide in the compact, for the rights and the consent of the citizens inhabiting it; as the inhabitants will find sufficient inducements of interest, to become willing parties to the cession; as they will have had their voice in the election of the government, which is to exercise authority over them; as a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages will, of course, be allowed them; and as the authority of the legislature of the state, and of the inhabitants of the ceded part of it, to concur in the cession, will be derived from the whole people of the state, in their adoption of the constitution, every imaginable objection seems to be obviated."

THE CINCINNATI REPUBLICAN.—*To the Editor*—Immediately preceding the call for the late anti-abolition meeting held in this city, there appeared in the Republican, and in another of the daily papers, several editorial articles, abusive of me by name, and having for their object to hold me up, personally, to public reproach and obloquy. This course could but produce in my mind some degree of surprise, because it was utterly at variance with any, which my notions of propriety would have directed me, had our circumstances been reversed, to pursue toward you. Had I determined to resist the dissemination of opinions, thought to be dangerous to the community—of opinions entertained by you, in common with many respectable and intelligent citizens—it would have been made a matter of patient deliberation how far, in striving for my object, I could justify myself in holding up you, personally, before the public, as one deserving its indignation, whilst I carefully suppressed your opinions, and the grounds on which they were supported. More ripe, still, would have been my deliberation, could I have ascertained by enquiry (which under such circumstances, I should have held it a matter of duty to make) that, had I called on you for an exposition of your peculiar views, before I proceeded to do you an injury which I might not be able to repair, I should have been treated not only with the civility due to a neighbor and a gentleman, but with the frankness of one, who, believing his opinions to be right, has no motive for withholding or disguising them, or the reasons which sustain them. Above all, would I have been slow to condemn you for entertaining any opinions—so long as they were published with becoming decency of expression, and your conduct, that of an orderly and law-abiding man.

It is natural for every honest mind to feel indignant at wrong—although it be done to another. We are not less so, when we ourselves are made the subjects of it—especially when conscious of our own rectitude; and where we have strong reason to believe, that injustice is done us either to serve some selfish end, or from a reckless disregard of all right. To your un courteous and ungenerous attack in the Republican of the 15th ultimo, so well fitted to excite indignant feelings, I replied in the gentlest terms that could be employed by one, who thought his duty to give some rebuke to injustice; and not without hope, that its mildness would correct, in some degree, the acrimony of your temper, and contribute to lay the foul spirit, under whose influence you seem, unfortunately, to have fallen. I was mistaken: It served only to give additional energy to its influence; so that up to this time, so far as I have evidence, your wrath "knows no retiring ebb, but keeps right on"—refusing to be satisfied, till I consent to the dishonorable record that I, first—in my own case—have voluntary surrendered rights that are inestimable to freemen and formidable to tyrants only; or, till I suffer in my person, or in my property—or, it may be, in both—the penalty of popular violence, demanded by the advocates of misrule, and the enemies of republican principles, against all who fearlessly and perseveringly contend for them.

The appearance of the article above-mentioned, I had determined, notwithstanding its abusive and injurious character to me, personally, calmly to attempt to correct, what a charitable construction would call, your errors, in relation to the views and principles of abolitionists. Such an attempt, if successful, I thought would be no unimportant public service. From this I have been diverted—so far as you are concerned—by the "Preamble and Resolutions" of the anti-abolition meeting,—which I propose taking up, and examining, with the same object I had in view, when I proposed answering you at greater length. It was no part of my place, to retort on you any of the opprobrious names you were pleased, with such prodigality, to expend on me. My respect for this community, for myself, and for you, too, sir, as a man, and therefore my equal, is altogether too deliberate, to permit such a course. The advocacy of the freedom of the press—of speech—of the great principles of human liberty, on which our government was founded—however you and others may disregard them—is in a dignity and an elevation which repudiate such auxiliaries. Rest assured, then, sir, as long as I cherish a proper regard for those principles, the unswerving maintenance of which—however "fanatical" it may appear to you—constitutes the honorable distinction of abolitionists—that the dictionaries of our language will not be ransacked for hard names with which to stigmatize opponents, although in numberless instances the whole world might declare their title to the "sum total" of them was indisputable. I know of no reproach so delicate—or which is likely to prove so efficacious to the reviler, who has not yet thrown away the last remnant of generosity—as, not to revile again. With this rule before me, I shall now proceed to give you some of the reasons, why

the abolitionists will succeed not only in bringing about emancipation on the best terms possible—but in re-establishing on a firmer basis than ever, the free principles of our republic; and why their adversaries will, of course, sink in public estimation, in proportion as their opposition has been unrelenting and merciless.

1. First of all, the cause of LIBERTY is a good cause—the cause of OPPRESSION is a bad one everywhere. God, in his providence, favors the first—with the latter he is ever displeased. He cheers and animates those who, in his fear, contend for liberty—whilst he distracts and dispirits the upholders of oppression.

2. You, advocates of slavery, become alarmed, and lose your self-possession. The publication of the fact, that there was in this city an anti-slavery society, composed of "intelligent and respectable" citizens, struck into you as great alarm, as if you had just been informed that the Asiatic cholera had broken out in the house of your next neighbor.

3. Your agitation hurries you into imprudent measures. Instead of setting yourselves industriously to work, to find out what you are assailed, and what kind of armor you should put on—you straightway call in anger, as an auxiliary to your fear.

4. Urged on by these two passions, you have recourse to "Preamble and Resolutions." Taking no pains to understand what abolitionism is, you either miss the object at which you aim—or you "resolve" many things which violate the plainest dictates of common sense—that run, jam up, against the barriers of liberty—or that expose you to the ridicule of abolitionists and others. The pro-slavery aristocracy of Boston, with the Mayor at their head, of New York, of Philadelphia, and of many smaller cities, passed their "Preambles and Resolutions," as you did here, doubting not, they would be "satisfactory to the south"—and what has been the result? Is the cause of freedom dead in any of these places? No: it lives and flourishes in them all. The reason is this—that "Preambles and Resolutions" passed, with whatever unanimity, by "capitalists, merchants, and tradesmen," who are linked in with the south, have no tendency to convince the people, that they should join in a crusade against those principles, which if kept unimpaired are sufficient to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their children after them. Your "Preambles and Resolutions" dictated by passion, contain little or no argument. The people see it, and regard them accordingly.

5. When "Preambles and Resolutions" fail, you forthwith fall into a frenzy, and resort to the work of stirring up mobs against those, by whom you are always defeated in argument. The people see this—and notwithstanding the obtuseness which you may be disposed to attribute to them, they know how to estimate it. To give you an instance of your loss of temper—in the anti-abolition meeting you resolved, (what you had a perfect right to do) that the publications of anti-slavery societies should not be introduced into your houses, counting-rooms, or workshops. And further, (what was very idle) that you would "exert every lawful effort" to put down my paper. Notwithstanding this recorded pledge of "the most distinguished and influential men of the city"—"judges, merchants, lawyers, divines, physicians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists," &c. &c.—it is scarcely one short week before you seem to forget the resolution, and openly proclaim, if abolitionists will not consent to be peaceably put down, they must be forcibly put down. Thus you seem to lose confidence in your own prescriptions. Now, mobs—if you would consider only a moment—have no efficacy, any more than "Preambles and Resolutions" without argument, to put down principles. They may tear down a house—or rifle a printing-office—but there is in them no adaptation for putting down opinions. Indeed, all past experience would seem to prove, that they, somehow or other, add to their powers of propagation. In the city of New York, where the experiment of putting down principles by mobs was first tried, now, all is quiet; so very quiet, that during the reign of mobocracy, generally, throughout the country, last summer and autumn, the busiest energy of southern gentlemen operating in that city—displaying itself in menaces and in public meetings—was not sufficient to resuscitate the drooping and discomfited spirit of mobocracy which had rioted there but twelve months before.

In Utica, where the Anti-Slavery Convention was mobbed by judges, Congressmen, and "gentlemen of property and standing," the "Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society" has, since, been formed, and the very journal (the Standard and Democrat) that suffered from the violence of the mob, is the organ of the "New York Anti-Slavery Society."

In sundry other places, "Preambles and Resolutions" have been passed, within the last six months, by "merchants and tradesmen" having close connexion with the south, and by "capitalists" as mighty as any in this city,—all this has been done, and you ought to know, they have served, as spring-boards to abolitionism. Yet, you refused to be admonished by experience. You would try the experiment in this city;—and with what effect?

Many reject with utter abhorrence the principles embodied in the "Preambles and Resolutions," while others look on the whole proceeding as supremely ridiculous. More than this, it has turned the attention of many of our "intelligent and respectable" citizens to an examination of our principles—informing them of what is doing by the friends of liberty here, and made them anxious to see, for themselves, what there is in this paper which could draw on it the ire of so many of the "most distinguished and influential men of the city." Since the "great abolition meeting," the subscription-list of the Philanthropist has increased more than two hundred names—not, to be sure, drawn, in any manner, from "merchants, capitalists, and tradesmen," whose interests are closely interwoven with the slave states, but from working men, who value the unfeigned investigation of truth, and the blessings of liberty above all the benefits—great as they may be—that can be derived from southern commerce when the subjects of it—its cotton and its sugar—are stained with the blood of our helpless fellow-men, and moistened with their tears of sorrow and despair.

There are one thousand and one other reasons, but I cannot go into them as fully as I have done those already mentioned. I must confine myself almost to the bare statement of a few more.

6. Abolitionists keep cool—you do not, and thus you impair your reasoning powers. They have the same advantage that a powerful combatant has, who, knowing his superiority, is calm and collected, whilst his adversary is foaming with rage and exhausting his strength in the frantic gesticulations of a madman.

7. When routed in argument you turn round and call hard names—the abolitionists answer by circumlocution—and by praying for their persecutors.

8. The abolitionists have studied the constitutions of

our state and general governments, to arrive at their true meaning,—you to ascertain how far they will serve you to support the system of slavery. From this cause, you are continually venturing on such assertions as these—"that anti-slavery objects are 'unconstitutional'—'at variance with the federal compact'—'revolutionary,' &c. &c. An abolitionist in the "preparatory department" can expose their fallacy.

9. Abolitionists understand their whole cause, including the history of slavery and emancipation everywhere;—you do not, and your lack of knowledge is incessantly exposing you to their home thrusts.

10. Abolitionists are all sober men. I do not know an intemperate man among them. They are "working men"—pushing on continually the great enterprise in which they are engaged. Dam them up for a moment—they lose nothing, for when the impediment is removed, their rush is overwhelming.

11. Abolitionists favor a system of oppression nowhere, and under no circumstances—least of all in the south, where to support it, it is necessary to reduce our own citizens of the north to the condition of slaves.

12. Abolitionists feel indignant when a slaveholding governor would recommend them to establish slavery in the free states—you do not.

13. Abolitionists do not believe with Gov. McDuffie that the Bible sanctions slavery,—you do, or at least you act as if you did.

14. Abolitionists are friends to the supremacy of the laws—you call on mobs to overthrow them.

Lastly. Abolitionists, believing they are right, will never cease, till convinced by argument that they are wrong, from every proper effort to abolish slavery once and forever throughout this land—and to re-establish the almost down-trodden rights of the press and of free discussion.

Now, sir, you see the odds against which you are contending. You have the ARISTOCRACY—we, the PEOPLE;—you have INDOLENCE—we, ACTIVITY;—you have WEALTH—we, PRINCIPLES;—you have PASSION—we, CONSTANCY;—you have the spirit of OPPRESSION—we, of LIBERTY;—you have VIOLENCE and CURSES—we, PATIENCE and PRAYERS;—you have the DISPLEASURE of God—we, his BLESSING.

Which side do you think will triumph?

EDITORIAL WIT.—In the first number of this paper, we said, "it was not our design to pour out our publications on the south unmasked. Four consecutive numbers beginning with the first will be sent—as we trust without giving offence or provoking abuse, to several of the principal journals in the slave states. Should they not be sent in exchange, ours will be discontinued."

So far as we yet know, this has disarmed the rage of all slaveholding editors to whom our paper has been sent—except the editor of the *Western Methodist* at Nashville. Our first number he returned, merrily directing it to the *Anti-Philanthropist*. Our second (which seems completely to have knocked the head out of his vinegar cask) came close on its heels with these bitter memoranda, inscribed on the margin—"Mischiefous meddling, The Bane of freedom"—"Philanthropy run Mad—or its antepode"—"The Murderer of America—disturber of the peace." So was John Wesley, who, though dead, yet speaketh to this editor, his professed follower, in these words, "The blood of thy brother crieth against thee from the earth. O, whatever it costs, put a stop to its cry, before it too late; instantly, at any price, were it of half of your goods, deliver thyself from blood-guiltiness. Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house and thy lands at present, are stained with blood. Surely it is enough; accumulate no more guilt; spill no more blood of the innocent. Whether you are a Christian or not, show yourself a man." So was Dr. Adam Clarke. Hear him—"In heathen countries, slavery was in some sort excusable; among Christians, it is an enormity and a crime for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment."

The Methodists were "disturbers of the peace" when, at their conference (in England) in 1780, they declared that slavery was contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and hurtful to society; CONTRARY TO THE DICTATES OF CONSCIENCE AND PURE RELIGION.

The Methodist church was a "disturber of the peace" when, at its original organization, four years afterward, it adopted as a rule, that "every member in their society should legally execute and record an instrument [for the purpose of setting free every slave in his possession] within the space of two years." If this was not complied with, within twelve months thereafter, "he was to be excluded from their society," and "those who bought or sold slaves, or gave them away, unless on purpose to free them, were to be expelled immediately."

The Methodist church was a "disturber of the peace" so late as 1801, when it declared that "every member who should sell a slave, should immediately after full proof, be excluded from the society; and that if any member purchased a slave, the ensuing quarterly meeting should determine on the number of years in which the slave so purchased should work out the price of his purchase."

But the southern Methodist Church (would we could say, this was all) are giving unequivocal testimony, that they have ceased from being such "disturbers of the peace" as were their distinguished and pious founders. They are fast laying aside the divine armor of Wesley and Fletcher, and Clarke, and Watson, and instead of using it themselves for the extermination of this sin, they become alarmed at the very appearance of others, who have taken it up and clothed themselves in it—crying out continually, with the demoniac of the tombs, "torment me not!!"

Would that the followers of Wesley were such "disturbers of the peace" as he was! A few such "disturbers of the peace" among them in the west and south-west, would make short work with slavery.

INPRUDENCE OF SLAVEHOLDERS.—Since our last, in which we gave an account of threats made against us personally, and against our press, by some of our slaveholding neighbors in Kentucky, we have had an interview with the gentleman there referred to. He is a resident of Mason county, Ky., and a "gentleman of property and standing." He came to our dwelling-house in Cincinnati a few days since (we doubt not in a friendly spirit) and gave us the following account: "That the people of Mason county had some time since organized a company for the double purpose of watching the negroes and barring against the entrance of abolitionists and their publications. That with a view of making the measure effectual, they had put at its head a man of thoroughgoing and desperate courage, named —. That its operations had been thus far so successfully conducted, that now it was impossible for persons in that county, to receive and

hand over to others, any anti-slavery document, without detection. That detection would be followed instantaneously with disgraceful and painful, if not capital punishment.

Among other things which, it was considered, fell specially within the line of the company's duty, was the attack on our office and printing-press. The Philanthropist was to be put down—this was a settled point—whether it were at New Richmond or in the city of Cincinnati and that our own responsibility, which would be a safeguard to us in any other cause, would in this afford to our personal safety no protection."

Our informant, we doubt not, has full faith in the *punishment* of his countrymen. We do not, yet, believe, that their folly has risen to such a height. It would be the consummation of imprudence. It would not only be a hazardous enterprise to themselves, personally—but an insult to the people of this state, under which the most patient spirit would be aroused to indignation. Whilst it would be as the letting out of waters, to the feelings of the free states, restrained as yet, under the taunts and goadings of the south, it would not for one moment stay the progress of abolition. Did we desire to advance our cause by the wickedness of those who oppose it, there is nothing that we should more earnestly wish for, than a forcible assault by a band of slaveholders, on the liberty of the press and of speech, in the state of Ohio. But we wish no such auxiliary. We deplore it. The cause of freedom is based on principle—and by principle alone do we wish it to advance. We pray that its triumph may be the triumph of Truth and Righteousness, and not of Passion displaying itself in deeds of violence. Again do we warn our neighbors of Kentucky, to cease from designs of violence. Let them not be misled by our city resolutions and editorial pro-slavery bombast. The substance of the country—the people are against them. They love liberty at home more than slavery abroad, and when summoned to its defence by an attack on the freedom of speech and of the press, its strongest outposts, their cry will be to the last, "don't give up the ship!"

STIMULANTS TO MOBS.—Although it is mid-winter with our population g nearly—*Caniculus* has risen, and reigns with no common despotism over certain of our dough-faced editors. With them, it is the middle of the dog-days, if we may judge from the rabidness into which their McDuffies have grown. It was but a few days ago, they pledged themselves—and were successful in beguiling many respectable and well-meaning men to do the same thing—to exert every "lawful" effort to put down our press. But they have forgotten the pledge, or have lost confidence in the efficacy of their own prescription. They now begin to sound the tocsin for *unlawful* effort and to excite to insurrection in such language as this—"Should he and they [the editor of the Philanthropist and the respectable men who are members of the Cincinnati Anti-Slavery Society] however, be so mad, as still to persist in their present course, they assume an awful responsibility, and the consequences must be on their own ill-fated heads." [Cin. Whig, Jan. 25.]

A few days later in another of the pro-slavery prints of Cincinnati, we find it proclaimed—"that every friend of his country, and every American patriot is called upon by the ties of humanity, patriotism, and honor, to put down abolition and abolitionists peacefully if we can and forcibly if we must." [Republican, Jan. 30.]

Here is a direct summons to the lawless and disorderly part of the community to break down the sacred muniments placed around the press and the persons, as well as the property of every citizen engaged in conducting it—unless he tamely surrenders his rights, and in doing so, the rights of every freeman of the state—at the dictation of one as impious in his requisitions as if he was the overseer of Gov. McDuffie, standing, whip in hand, over his crouching slaves. And where is the Mayor of the city when his authority is thus set at open defiance? Does he go to these editors, and caution them against such expressions?—Does he advise them against such law-breaking attempts? We fear not.

Would it not be well for the leading gentlemen, who were concerned, in calling and conducting the late anti-abolition meeting in Cincinnati, to exonerate themselves from the slightest connexion with such inflammatory appeals, by publishing an open disapprobation of them. Till they do so, they must be considered as in some degree responsible for them; because no editor in this city, for some time previous to the anti-abolition meeting, would have had the hardihood, boldly to advise a violation of the indisputable rights of their fellow-citizens, and the utter overthrow of all law.

SAND FROIN.—The people of Danville, says the Richmond Chronicle, are not only opposed to abolition but amalgamation. They tarred and feathered a black man and a white woman a few days since, for intermarrying with each other."

[The above is from one of the Cincinnati papers warmly engaged in maintaining southern rights at the expense of northern rights. The manner in which such an outrage on law, human and divine, is mentioned by such a journal ought not therefore to surprise us.] The following is from a religious journal—

AMALGAMATION.—A black man and white woman, who had intermarried, were lately tarred and feathered at Danville. Amalgamation is abominable in any shape, whether sanctioned by marriage or otherwise."

If the nonchalance of the last article is assumed, with the expectation of pleasing the generality of slaveholders, it may be to a considerable extent successful. But of one thing we are assured—it will not please the readers of the Journal from which it is taken, who reside at and near the scene where this enormity was perpetrated. We profess to have some knowledge of them—and unless they have undergone a great alteration for the worse, within the last three or four months—there will be none found, anywhere, who will, in terms of greater indignation condemn this illegal and high-handed outrage. We have scarcely a doubt, when the particulars are known, that it will be found to have been perpetrated by the same persons who, last summer, were the most busy in rifling the post-office of papers which did not belong to them.

To SUBSCRIBERS.—An alteration in our press, which had become indispensable—and which could be made only at Cincinnati—has compelled us to lose our number for last week. The stopping of the steamboats by the ice, and the bad state of the roads, prevented us from having our press returned in time to print our sixth number. We will endeavor to supply it during the year. The pro-slavery influence in Cincinnati puts us to great inconvenience. The sickness of the Editor's family prevents him from removing it to this place, or from leaving it, but for a few days at a time. Our friends will see in this statement sufficient excuse for occasional failures, which, we trust, will not again occur.

Our paper has been regularly mailed for subscribers—so far as we know—without any omission. A correspondent in New York, to whom it is sent, had not received his—nor do we believe any of our subscribers there had received theirs, so late as the 23d of January. We know not how this has happened. We

Poetry.

IS THERE NONE TO LAMENT?

BY THOMAS GREGG, ESQ.

Is there none to lament for poor Africa's daughters, [wave,
Who are forced from their homes, far beyond the dark
To the land of white strangers, far o'er the blue waters,
And doom'd to the toil and the woe of the slave?

There's weeping and wailing in Congo's palm bowers,
And sad is the plaint on broad Gambia's shore—
For, no more shall the dark exiles cult the bright dowers,
No more shall they hark to the wave's sullen roar!

Oh! weep, lady weep, for Africa's daughters!
For deep is the anguish, and loud is the wail,
That floats far and wide o'er her deep swelling waters,
And is wafted afar on the wings of the gale.

But hearken! a voice has gone forth o'er her mountains,
And a sound, as of gladness, hath rung from her shore:
No more shall bright tear-drops enrich her clear fountains,
The wail of her children shall soon be no more.

Ah! who will rejoice, now, with Africa's daughters?
From their golden-paved fountains, Oppression no more
Shall force them away, far beyond the blue waters—
Once again they are free—their dark bondage is o'er.

Cincinnati Mirror.

Miscellaneous.

DR. CHANNING ON SLAVERY.

CHAPTER I.—PROPERTY.

THE slaveholder claims the slave as his property. The very idea of a slave is that he belongs to another, that he is bound to live and labor for another, to be another's instrument, and to make another's will his habitual law, however adverse to his own. Another owns him, and of course has a right to his time and strength, a right to the fruits of his labor, a right to task him without his consent, and to determine the kind and duration of his toil, a right to confine him to any bounds, a right to extort the required work by stripes, a right, in a word, to use him as a tool, without contract, against his will, and in denial of his right to dispose of himself, or to use his power for his own good. "A slave," says the Louisiana code, "is in the power of the master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master." "Slaves shall be deemed, taken, reputed, and adjudged," say the South Carolina laws, "to be chattels personal in the hands of the masters, and possessions to all intents and purposes whatsoever." Such is slavery, a claim to man as property.

Now this claim of property in a human being is altogether false, groundless. No such right of man in man can exist. A human being cannot be justly owned. To hold and treat him as property is to inflict a great wrong, to incur the guilt of oppression.

This position there is a difficulty in maintaining on account of its exceeding obviousness. It is too plain for proof. To defend it is like trying to confirm a self-evident truth. To find arguments is not easy, because an argument is something clearer than the proposition to be sustained. The man, who, on hearing the claim to property in man, does not see and feel distinctly that it is a cruel usurpation, is hardly to be reached by reasoning, for it is hard to find any plainer principles than what he begins with denying. I will endeavor, however, to illustrate the truth which I have stated.

1. It is plain, that, if one man may be held as property, then every other man may be so held. If there be nothing in human nature, in our common nature, which excludes and forbids the conversion of him who possesses it into an article of property; if the right of the free to liberty is founded, not on their essential attributes as rational and moral beings, but on certain adventitious, accidental circumstances, into which they have been thrown; then every human being, by a change of circumstances, may justly be held and treated by another as property. If one man may be rightfully reduced to slavery, then there is not a human being on earth the same chain may not be imposed. Now let every reader ask himself this plain question: Could I, can I, be rightfully seized, and made an article of property; be made a passive instrument of another's will and pleasure; be subjected to stripes at another's will; be denied the control and use of my own limbs and faculties for my own good? Does any man, so questioned, doubt, waver, look about him for an answer? Is not the reply given immediately, intuitively, by his whole inward being? Does not an unhesitating, unerring conviction spring up in my breast, that no other man can acquire such a right in myself? Do we not repel indignantly and with horror the thought of being reduced to the condition of tools and chattels to a fellow-creature? Is there any moral truth more deeply rooted in us, than that such a degradation would be an infinite wrong? And if this impression be a delusion, on what single moral conviction can we rely? This deep assurance, that we cannot be rightfully made another's property, does not rest on the hue of our skins, or the place of our birth, or our strength, or wealth. These things do not enter our thoughts. The consciousness of indestructible rights is a part of our moral being. The consciousness of our humanity involves the persuasion, that we cannot be owned as a tree or a brute. As men we cannot justly be made slaves. Then no man can be rightfully enslaved. In casting the yoke from ourselves as an unspeakable wrong, we condemn ourselves as wrong doers and oppressors in laying it on any who share our nature. It is not necessary to enquire whether a man, by extreme guilt, may not forfeit the right of his nature, and be justly punished with slavery. On this point crude notions prevail. But the discussion would be foreign to the present subject. We are not now speaking of criminals. We speak of innocent men, who have given us no hold on them by guilt; and our own consciousness is a proof, that such cannot rightfully be seized as property by a fellow-creature.

2. A man cannot be seized and held as property, because he has rights. What these rights are, whether few or many, or whether all men have the same, are questions for future discussion. All that is assumed now is, that every human being has some rights. This truth cannot be denied, but by denying to a portion of the race that moral nature which is the sure and only foundation of rights. This truth has never, I believe, been disputed. It is even recognised in the very codes of slave-legislation, which, while they strip a man of liberty, affirm his right to life, and threaten his murderer with punishment. Now, I say a being having rights cannot justly be made property; for this claim over him virtually annuls all his rights. It strips him of all power to assert them. It makes it a crime to assert them. The very essence of slavery is, to put a man defenceless into the hands of another. The right claimed by the master to task, to force, to imprison, to whip, and to punish the slave at discretion, and especially to prevent the least resistance to his will, is a virtual denial and subversion of all the rights of the victim of his power. The two cannot stand together. Can we doubt which of them ought to fail?

3. Another argument against property is to be found in the essential equality of men. I know that this doctrine, so venerable in the eyes of our fathers, has lately been denied. Verbal logicians have told us that men are "born equal," only in the sense of being equally born. They have asked whether all are equally tall, strong, or beautiful; or whether nature, Procrustes-like, reduces all her children to one standard of intellect and virtue. By such arguments it is attempted to set aside the principle of equality, on which the soundest moralists have reared the structure of social duty; and in these ways the old foundations of despotic power, which our fathers in their simplicity thought they had subverted, are laid again by their sons.

It is freely granted, that there are innumerable diversities among men; but be it remembered, they are ordained to bind men together, and not to subdue one to the others, ordained to give means and occasions of mutual aid, and to carry forward each and all, so that the good of all is equally intended in the distribution of various gifts. Be it also remembered, that these diversities among men are as nothing in comparison with the attributes in which they agree, and it is this which constitutes their essential equality. All men have the same rational nature, and the same power of conscience, and all are equally made for indefinite improvement of these divine faculties, and for the happiness to be found in their virtuous use. Who, that comprehends these gifts, does not see that the diversities of the race vanish before them? Let it be added, that the natural advantages, which distinguish one man from another, are so bestowed as to counterbalance one another, and bestowed without regard to rank or condition in life. Whoever surpasses in one endowment is inferior in others. Even genius, the greatest gift, is found in union with strange infirmities, and often places its possessors below ordinary men in the conduct of life. Great learning is often put to shame by the mother-wit and keen good sense of uneducated men. Nature, indeed, pays no heed to birth or condition in bestowing her favors. The noblest spirits sometimes grow up in the obscurest spheres. Thus equal are men; and among these equals, who can substantiate his claim to make others his property, his tools, the mere instruments of his private interests and gratification? Let this claim begin, and where will it stop? If one may assert it, why not all? Among these partakers of the same rational and moral nature, who can make good a right over others, which others may not establish over himself? Does he insist upon superior strength of body or mind? Who of us has no superior in one or the other of these endowments? Is it not true that the slave or the slave's child may not surpass his master in intellectual energy or in moral worth? Has nature conferred distinctions which tell us plainly, who shall be owners and who be owned? Who of us can unblushingly lift his head and say that God has written "Master" there? or who can show the word "slave" engraved on his brother's brow? The equality of nature makes slavery a wrong. Nature's seal is affixed to no instrument, by which property in a single human being is conveyed.

4. That a human being can be justly held and used as property is apparent from the very nature of property. Property is an exclusive single right. It shuts out all claim but that of the possessor. What one man owns cannot belong to another. What, then, is the consequence of holding a human being as property? Plainly this. He can have no right to himself. His limbs are, in truth, not morally his own. He has not a right to his own strength. It belongs to another. His will, intellect, and muscles, all the powers of body and mind which are exercised in labor, he is bound to regard as another's. Now, if there be property in any thing, it is that of a man in his own person, mind, and strength. All other rights are weak, unmeaning, compared with this, and in denying this all right is denied. It is true that an individual may forfeit by crime his right to the use of his limbs, perhaps to his limbs, and even to life. But the very idea of forfeiture implies that the right was originally possessed. It is true that a man may by contract give to another a limited right to his strength. But he gives only because he possesses it, and gives it for considerations which he deems beneficial to himself; and the right ceases at once on violation of the conditions on which it was bestowed. To deny the right of a human being to himself, to his own limbs and faculties, to his energy of body and mind, is an absurdity too gross to be confuted by any thing but a simple statement. Yet this absurdity is involved in the idea of his belonging to another.

5. We have a plain recognition of the principle now laid down, in the universal indignation excited towards a man who makes another his slave. Our laws know no higher crime than that of reducing a man to slavery. To steal or to buy an African on his own shores is piracy. In this act the greatest wrong is inflicted, the most sacred right violated. But if a human being cannot without infinite injustice be seized as property, then he cannot without equal wrong be held and used as such. The wrong in the first seizure lies in the destination of a human being to future bondage, to the criminal use of him as a chattel or brute. Can that very use, which makes the original seizure an enormous wrong, become gradually innocent? If the slave receive injury without measure at the first moment of the outrage, is he less injured by being held fast the second or the third? Does the duration of wrong, the increase of it by continuance, convert it into right? It is true, in many cases, that length of possession is considered as giving a right, where the goods were acquired by unlawful means. But in these cases the goods were such as might justly be appropriated to individual use. They were intended by the Creator to be owned. They fulfil their purpose by passing into the hands of an exclusive possessor. It is essential to rightful property in a thing, that the thing from its nature may be rightfully appropriated. If it cannot originally be made one's own without crime, it certainly cannot be continued as such without guilt. Now, the ground, on which the seizure of the African on his own shore is condemned, is, that he is a man, who has by his nature a right to be free. Ought not, then, the same condemnation to light on the continuance of his yoke? Still more. Whence is it that length of possession is considered as conferring a right? I answer, from the difficulty of determining the original proprietor, and from the apprehension of unsettling all property by carrying back enquiry beyond a certain time. Suppose, however, an article of property to be of such a nature that it could bear the name of the true original owner, stamped on it in bright and indelible characters. In this case, the whole ground on which length of possession bars other claims, would fail. The proprietor would not be concealed or rendered doubtful by the lapse of time. Would not he, who should receive such an article from a robber or a succession of robbers, be involved in their guilt? Now, the true owner of a human being is made manifest to all. It is himself. No brand on the slave was ever so conspicuous as the mark of property which God has set on him. God, in making him a rational and moral being, has put a glorious stamp on him, which all the slave-legislation and slave-markets of world cannot efface. Hence no right accrues to the master from the length of the wrong which has been done to the slave.

6. Another argument against the right of property in man may be drawn from a very obvious principle of moral science. It is a plain truth, universally received, that every right supposes or involves a corresponding obligation. If, then, a man has a right to another's person or powers, the latter is under obligation to give himself up as a chattel to the former. This is his duty. He is bound to be a slave; and bound not merely by the Christian law which enjoins submission to injury, not merely by prudential considerations, or by the claims of public order

and peace; but bound because another has a right of ownership, has a moral claim on him, so that he would be guilty of dishonesty, of robbery, in withdrawing himself from this other's service. It is his duty to work for his master, though all compulsion were withdrawn; and in deserting him he would commit the crime of taking away another man's property, as truly as if he were to carry off his owner's purse. Now, do we not instantly feel, can we help feeling, that this is false? Is the slave thus morally bound? When the African was first brought to these shores, would he have violated a solemn obligation, by slipping his chain, and flying back to his native home? Would he not have been bound to seize the precious opportunity of escape? Is the slave under a moral obligation to confine himself, his wife, and children, to a spot where their union in a moment may be forcibly dissolved? Ought he not, if he can, to place himself and his family under the guardianship of equal laws? Should we blame him for leaving his yoke? Do we not feel, that in the same condition, a sense of duty would quicken our flying steps? Where, then, is the obligation which would necessarily be imposed, if the right existed which the master claims? The absence of obligation proves the want of the right. The claim is groundless. It is a cruel wrong.

7. I come now to what is to my own mind the great argument against seizing and using a man as property. He cannot be property in the sight of God and justice, because he is a rational, moral, immortal being, because created in God's image, and therefore in the highest sense his child; because created to unfold godlike faculties, and to govern himself by a divine law written on his heart, and republished in God's word. His whole nature forbids that he should be seized as property. From his very nature it follows, that so to seize him is to offer an insult to his Maker, and to inflict aggravated social wrong. Into every human being God has breathed an immortal spirit more precious than the whole outward creation. No earthly or celestial language can exaggerate the worth of a human being. No matter how obscure his condition. Thought, reason, conscience, the capacity of virtue, the capacity of Christian love, and immortal destiny, an intimate moral connexion with God,—here are attributes of our national character, and the most traitorous machinations against the fundamental principles of our social compact, as a federal republic, that have ever been attempted since the era of our existence. Indeed, the darkest ages of mental and political slavery, in any quarter of the globe, never gave birth to despotic pretensions more abhorrent to eternal justice and philanthropy than these which we proceed to refute. Heretofore, slavery,—intuitively repulsive and detestable slavery,—naeante to the mortal sense in its name as in its nature—has been defended only upon the ground of temporary expedient, and the difficulty of its abolition under peculiar circumstances. But now, in this official message of Governor McDuffie of South Carolina, it is not only ignorantly claimed as an institution fraught and glowing with divinity—or direct ordination by the living God, and enacted by his irrevocable seal,—but also as an essential and constituent element of all free and republican governments! Hitherto its most bigoted and callous-hearted apologists represented it as a necessary evil, entailed upon us by an unenlightened and despotic foreign power, which we were to endure with patience until an era should arrive when we might abolish it without social and proprietary evasions, or a precipitate and hypocritical interference in behalf of the slaves themselves. But now, in this official declaration of a sovereign state, it is claimed as a necessary and abstract good, and therefore fortunately and beneficially bequeathed to our soil by its primitive professors, and to be defended even to the penal sacrifice of the lives of all these citizens throughout the United States, who shall presume to give publicity to their opinion of its natural injustice or social iniquity! Yes, this message expresses the "deliberate opinion that the laws of every community should punish THIS SPECIES OF INTERFERENCE BY DEATH WITHOUT BENEFIT OF THE CLERGY." But whether this pious and divinely illuminated Governor McDuffie meant by the latter terrible clause of this penalty, that these offenders should be hanged without the common privilege, allowed to all condemned culprits, of participating in the ghastly consolations of a godly minister, or that they should be excommunicated from the intercession of the ecclesiastical power for the mercy of the temporal, as this clause anciently meant, and still formally means in England, is not clearly indicated. Since, however, an ecclesiastical interference with the civil power is not legally recognised in any state of our republic, we are compelled to select the inference that the governor demands that all such culprits shall go to the gallows praying "upon their own heads," and without any pastoral guides to rescue them from their just deserts in the bottomless pit.

Such a being was plainly made for an end in himself. He is a person, not a thing. He is an end, not a mere instrument or means. He was made for his own virtue and happiness. Is this end reconcilable with his being held and used as a chattel? The sacrifice of such a being to another's will, to another's present, outward, ill-comprehended good, is the greatest violence which can be offered to any creature of God. It is to degrade him from his rank in the universe, to make him a means, not an end, to cast him out and broken into a tool to another's physical enjoyment!

Such a being was plainly made for an end in himself. This is the essence of a moral being. He possesses, as a part of his nature, and the most essential part, a sense of duty, which he is to reverence and follow, in opposition to all pleasure or pain, to all interfering human wills. The great purpose of all good education and discipline is to make a man master of himself, to excite him to act from a principle in his own mind, to lead him to propes his own perfection as his supreme law and end. And is this highest purpose of man's nature to be reconciled with entire subjection to a foreign will, to an outward, overwhelming force, which is satisfied with nothing but complete submission?

The end of such a being as we have described is manifestly improvement. Now it is the fundamental law of our nature, that all our powers are to improve by free exertion. Action is the indispensable condition of progress to the intellect, conscience and strength. Is it not plain, then, that a human being cannot, without wrong, be owned by another, who claims, as proprietor, the right to repress the powers of his slaves, to withhold them from the means which are necessary to contentment in chains, to shut out every ray of light and every generous sentiment, which may interfere with entire subjection to his will?

No man, who seriously considers what human nature is, and what it was made for, can think of setting up a claim to a fellow-creature. What! own a spiritual being, a being made to know and adore God, and who is to outlive the sun and stars! What! chain to our lowest uses a being made for truth and virtue! Convert into a brute instrument that intelligent nature on which the idea of duty has dawned, and which is a nobler type of God than all outward creation! Should we not deem it a wrong which no punishment could expiate, were one of our children seized as property, and driven by the whip to toil? And shall God's child, dearer to him than an only son to a human parent, be thus degraded? Every thing else may be owned in the universe, but a moral rational being, cannot be property. Sun and stars may be owned, but not the lowest spirit, and the highest, that is, the spirit of the clergy! But whether this is true or not, the south know, that a human being, who has no inclination to adopt another mode of life, but although you have abandoned the like course of prostitution yourselves, yet I beseech you to kill—hang without benefit of the clergy! every person within your reach who points the finger of contempt towards me, or reprehends the lucrative disposal of my person to which I am devoted."

But let us sympathetically listen to and tenderly examine the arguments by which this moving appeal is enforced. "For the institution of domestic slavery we hold ourselves responsible only to God." And yet, dear sister, you hold everybody responsible to the halter who shall presume to express a doubt of the divine quality of that institution, or of its expediency even to yourself!" "No human institution in my opinion," says our dear sister's bully, McDuffie, "is more manifestly consistent with the will of God than domestic slavery." Now allowing that said bully is a pious and conscientious interpreter of the will of God, what credentials does he exhibit of a disinterestedness which secures the infallibility of his judgment? He says that "no one of God's ordinances is written in more legible characters than that which consigns the African race to this condition." Indeed! then it follows that although but a very small fraction of this race has hitherto been subjected to this fate, yet it will be, in good time; and that, therefore, the southern states are the bold pioneers in fulfilling this divine decree.

But our present limits compel us to defer our further reflections upon this interesting doctrine until our next number. In the meantime, we need not inform our readers that although we are decidedly opposed to the fanatical course of the immediate abolitionists, and should deeply deplore the calamities which would inevitably result from its unrestrained operation, we shall nevertheless raise our arm in fearless independence against the insolent invasion of the dearest and most sacred rights of our free states, so recently attempted in the official document upon which we comment.—New York Sun.

We have thus seen that a human being cannot rightfully be held and used as property. No legislation, not that of all countries or worlds, could make him so. Let this be laid down, as first, fundamental truth. Let us hold it fast, as a most sacred, precious truth. Let us hold it fast against all customs, all laws, all rank, wealth, and power. Let it be armed with the whole authority of the civilized and Christian world.

I have taken it for granted that no reader would be so wanting in moral discrimination and moral feeling, as to urge that men may be rightfully seized and held as property, because various governments have so ordained. What! is human legislation the measure of right? Are God's laws to be repealed by man's? Can government do no wrong? What is the history of human governments but a record of wrongs? How much does the progress of civilization consist in the substitution of just and humane, for barbarous and oppressive laws? Government, indeed, has ordained slavery, and to govern the individual is in no case to offer resistance. But criminal legislation ought to be freely and earnestly exposed. Injustice is never so terrible, and never so corrupting, as when armed with the sanctions of law.

The authority of government, instead of being a reason for silence under wrongs, is a reason for protesting against wrong with the undivided energy of argument, entreaty, and solemn admonition.

Northern Spirit.

GOVERNOR McDUFFIE.

THE SLAVERY MESSAGE.—From the unveiled and undisguised horrors of this monstrous production, the stanchest bloodhounds of slavery shrink in dismay. The purchased, the collared, the hungry pack of New York editors, who, under the plausible pretext of crying down the immediate abolitionists, have been struggling to destroy the moral sense of the community with regard to the iniquity of slavery in the abstract; and to perpetuate upon the forehead of a country assuming the attitude of peerless freedom, the foulest stigma that can new degrade any nation in the eyes of an enlightened world,—even this mercenary and unprincipled crew, quail recrently from the appalling chasm in justice and morals which this document reveals, and which their infernal allegiance had bound them to leap. Yes! even the Courier and Enquirer, that *Triclops apud Cherubim* of the yelling pack, dares not to encounter the dignified torrent of virtuous opinion which this official message from the gubernatorial chair of a republican state is everywhere arousing; but merely ventures to remark that the document is well written, in the style of its literary composition! We need not say that this small particular is too unimportant for our controversy, although such solecisms in language as that, "the existing auspices of the country are fearfully unpropitious," and others of like kind with which the production abounds, are no proofs of the Courier's assertion, or of the correctness of its literary judgment.

We have higher considerations in view; we have to present to the just reprobation of our fellow-citizens the most flagrant aggressions upon the purity of our national character, and the most traitorous machinations against the fundamental principles of our social compact, as a federal republic, that have ever been attempted since the era of our existence. Indeed, the darkest ages of mental and political slavery, in any quarter of the globe, never gave birth to despotic pretensions more abhorrent to eternal justice and philanthropy than these which we proceed to refute. Heretofore, slavery,—intuitively repulsive and detestable slavery,—naeante to the mortal sense in its name as in its nature—has been defended only upon the ground of temporary expedient, and the difficulty of its abolition under peculiar circumstances. But now, in this official message of Governor McDuffie of South Carolina, it is not only ignorantly claimed as an institution fraught and glowing with divinity—or direct ordination by the living God, and enacted by his irrevocable seal,—but also as an essential and constituent element of all free and republican governments! Hitherto its most bigoted and callous-hearted apologists represented it as a necessary evil, entailed upon us by an unenlightened and despotic foreign power, which we were to endure with patience until an era should arrive when we might abolish it without social and proprietary evasions, or a precipitate and hypocritical interference in behalf of the slaves themselves. But now, in this official declaration of a sovereign state, it is claimed as a necessary and abstract good, and therefore fortunately and beneficially bequeathed to our soil by its primitive professors, and to be defended even to the penal sacrifice of the lives of all these citizens throughout the United States, who shall presume to give publicity to their opinion of its natural injustice or social iniquity!

It may, indeed, be, that Governor Marey's ignorance on this subject is so great, that he actually judges of the number and